

# THE NEW REPUBLIC.

VOL. 1,

CLEVELAND, JUNE 14, 1862.

NO. 9.

## Two Theories; OR, THE INFIDEL'S MISTAKE.

BY C. M. OVERTON.

"There is such a thing as being a martyr to a mistake." So wrote Mary S. Gove Nichols, on one of the occasions on which she announced to the world an important change in her faith and principles. This enunciation struck me at the time as being one of the most piquant, powerful and original of the expressions of a woman who, almost more than any other woman in America, is noted for power, piquancy and originality of expression.

As a general statement, there can be no doubt that there is truth in the idea; and it is my business at this time to show that there is truth in it, in its application to that class of persons among which I have ranked myself, who in contradistinction to that which they term Supernatural, call themselves Naturalists, Rationalists, or Harmonial Philosophers.

I am fully aware that I shall be charged with fickleness and inconsistency by those who have been acquainted with me. And at times, when the Devil of Pride has the upper hand of me, I think more about this than I do about truth and conscience; more whether my course be consistent, than whether it be true; more whether it appear right, than whether it be right; more what I have said in the past, than what duty calls me to say in the future; more what men will say about me, than what their good demands I should say to them.

But is this right? Shall truth and duty, the love of right and your own soul's salvation, be sacrificed to a paltry consistency and the fear of what men will say? No, never! I say to you all, friends and foes, who would thus tempt me: "Get thee behind me, Satan!" "Let the dead bury their dead." My business is with the living present. I set my

foot upon the past—it shall never hold me in bondage. And whatever I have spoken, not in the truth as I now see it, shall be as though I had never said it. It shall not weigh in the balance against a soul. I owe no allegiance to anything or anybody but the truth and the Great Source of truth. I am free; and by the help of God I will remain so—free to be true to my convictions; free to be faithful to the present hour, though unfaithful to every one of my spoken words; free to be as unstable and inconsistent as the cause of truth demands. If I maintain a consistency between my thought and word, my convictions and my expressions of them, it is all that can be asked of me. I never professed to be infallible; I did profess to be honest. I do not now profess to be infallible; but I hope I am no less honest than formerly. No man is responsible for not having the whole truth, or for entertaining an error. Ignorance is pardonable; but hypocrisy and cowardice, never. A man who is faithful to error, honestly entertained, will be as faithful to the truth when he sees it. No man is damned for not accepting evidence which has never come to him. It is willfulness, dishonesty in dealing with that which has come, which damns the soul. Above all things else, let us be honest and candid with ourselves, though it oblige the throwing away of every preconceived, long-cherished opinion.

The fatal, fundamental mistake which I have made, as I now see it, is in building my theories and basing my hopes of success upon the natural instead of the supernatural, the human instead of the divine, the animal instead of the spiritual, the "Rationalistic" instead of the religious, nature of man. And this seems to me to be the fatal, all-comprehensive mistake of Infidel Reformers. We have been all head, and no heart. We have ignored religion; and in so doing have ignored the pivotal, and as I now believe, the highest and holiest element of man's nature. The stone which the

builders rejected has become the head of the corner; or will become such, whenever there is a building that has a corner.

We have reasoned well from our starting point; but the failure is in assuming the premises. There is no God. This is the first assumption, which is either openly or impliedly, or at all events practically made; (for there is no practical difference between Atheism and Pantheism). The Universe is a thing of chance, or necessity; and man is simply an offspring or adjunct of that Universe—an incident, an accident, or at best a consequence. If a subject, he is a subject, not of a Supreme Being, but of the Universe; responsible to nobody but the Universe, and himself, as the highest power in that Universe. He is simply a fact, like a river, a mountain, or a horse; or a thing of development, like a toadstool. Only he is a higher development, a more important fact; but still simply a fact, entitled like any other development or fact to the rights inhering in or springing from him as a fact—the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, consequent on his chance or necessitated existence. At best, according to this philosophy, he is but a high order of animal, entitled like other animals to the expression and expansion of all the powers and faculties necessary to his happiness as an animal.

Now if it be true that man is but an animal—an earthly production—a chance result of a chance Universe—a chance necessity or a necessitated chance, then our reasonings are good, and our philosophies are well founded.

But I believe that this world is not a chance world, and that man is neither a creature of chance, nor a thing of development simply. As I see it, he is not a production of the lower, but a subject or citizen of the higher. I believe that in some sense he is a fallen being. I believe that he not only will live in the future, but that he has lived in the past; that he lived in a state of comparative bliss; a state of existence of which he has almost lost the consciousness; and that in many cases our dissatisfaction with the present life originates from some faint reminiscence that ever and anon flits across the soul of that "good time" going or gone, and an involuntary, half-conscious comparison of the husks of the present life with the beatitudes of the lost estate; and that our efforts at improvement, our plans and projects for a better social state, are but a reaching out for a legacy that is lost—a blind groping of the soul for a re-installment into the beauties and glories once its own.

But what matters it whether man be natural or spiritual, indigenous or exotic? what has that to do with his duties and obligations, the proper conduct

of his life here? you may perhaps inquire. If man be of the earth, a thing of development from the soil, then he is properly a subject to the conditions of earth; and the laws and principles which go to regulate other productions of earth should regulate him. All he has to do is to grow, develop and enjoy; and his main concern with life will be to seek out for himself those conditions which will best promote his earthly enjoyment. His faculties being all good and in place, it becomes not only his right, but his duty, to cultivate and expand them to their fullest capacity for enjoyment, and to insist upon those conditions which will best enable him to do so.

A tree needs earth, air, moisture and sunshine, to sustain its life. It has a kind of right to them. An animal has other necessities, and consequently a right to have them supplied. The fact of possession, implies a right to use. Demand, necessitates a supply. Want, a need; and need, a justification. The fact, sanctifies existence—life and all its essentials—its methods, adjuncts and appurtenances. The right to life implies a right to a whole life, to such a life as the nature of the being demands; and each subject of life has a right to its own life, and is not to be put off with the scheme or fancy of another. An animal has a right to be an animal—he is entitled to all the rights of an animal life. And if man be but an animal, a product of mother earth, then he has a right, and it is his duty, to provide scope for his animal nature. But if he be a native of another clime—if he be of celestial origin and character, then perhaps, he may need an entirely different system of culture. If he really be a citizen of the skies, then his allegiance may be due to the ruler of the skies; and in being governed by the laws of earth, he may be not only a political (so to speak) but a physiological transgressor; he may be not only rebelling against legitimate rule, but doing constitutional violence to his own better nature.

Again, if man, now on earth, was once an inhabitant of the skies, and the condition of heaven be higher than that of earth, then he is not only out of his legitimate sphere, but he has exchanged a higher for a lower; and if there be a conflict between the two natures or conditions, and it be his wish to return or regain the higher, then it becomes his interest, to say nothing of his duty, to obey the higher instead of the lower, and to subordinate the one to the other. The law of the spiritual and celestial, instead of the earthly and animal, is the law which he should obey, and the regime of the skies, the one to which he should adapt himself.

But in what lies the difference? Individuality,

(by which I mean self-hood, and the maintenance of the right of self-hood,) and to assert and maintain that Individuality, amidst the various conflicting individualities and interests, seems to be the great aim of all existences on the lower and earthly plane. Self preservation is the first law of life with the animal nature. But on the higher, diviner plane, the individual is lost in the neighbor; self-love gives place to universal love, and self-development to self-abnegation; justice gives way to love, and rights to duties. The question then raised is not, What is due me from society or those around me? but, What can I do for society? What is my duty to my neighbor, and how can I best serve others?

The difference between the two systems is radical. In the relation which they sustain to each other, they are antagonistic and irreconcilable.

The Individualist cries out for justice; and if a man smite him on one cheek, he smites him on the other. He clamors for equity; and if a man take away his coat, he seizes a cloak as an equivalent. He cries out for the right; and if a man fail to give him half of the road, he shoves him aside, or runs against his vehicle.

How totally different from all this, are the inculcations of the gospel of love—the mandates of the Prince of Peace. If a man sue thee at law and take away thy coat, give him thy cloak also. If he smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other. If he claim three-fourths of the road, give him the other fourth—open the fence into the field, if need be, and go round him.

Assert thyself, is the injunction of Individuality. Deny thyself, is the requirement of Christianity. This is the animus of the one system, and this the essence of the other. Entirely distinct, separated by discreet degrees, they cannot blend, for what is life to the one is death to the other.

"Thou art a man, and thy mission is to preserve thyself intact," cries out the genius of Individuality, or Self-Love. "Stand by thy rights!"

"Thou art a God," whispers the still, small voice. "Thy mission is to preserve thy divinity. Thy kingdom is not of this world. Do not contaminate thy soul by warfare. Peril not thy divine estate in a strife after baubles. If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is better that one member be lost than that thy whole body be cast into fire. Follow not the temptations of the body to the destruction of the spirit; what shall it profit a man though he gain all the joys of sense, if he lose his own soul? Render not evil for evil, but overcome evil with good; for this is the law of the Gods!"

Ye have heard it said by them of old, Preserve thy Individuality at all hazards; look well to thy rights. But I say unto you, Your rights are trifles which you cannot afford to contend about. The rights of the spirit are paramount to those of the body. Would ye sacrifice the greater to the less? He who would save his earth-life, shall lose the life of the heavens! He who would lose his life here, for the truth's sake, shall inherit the life everlasting. Strive not after rank and preferment among men; the little distinctions of earth will avail! you nothing in the kingdom; the last shall be first, and the first last; let him who would be greatest, serve.

Ye have heard it said of old, Preserve thyself. The Sovereignty of the Individual, at his own cost. Render and receive an equivalent, in all things. But I say unto you, Preserve thy soul unsullied. The sovereignty of the spirit, over all that is earthly, animal and selfish. Deal honestly with all men; but stand not upon equivalents, for it is more blessed to give than to receive. A new commandment give I unto you: That ye love one another. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; and he who does so love his neighbor, will not be anxious whether the one or the other hold more of the property, which belongs none of it to them, except as stewards of the lord and master.

I would not be understood as underrating the principle of equivalents, as enunciated by Josiah Warren and others. It has its use, and that an important one. Every one should be just, before they are generous; and in order to be just, we must know what justice is. And so far as this enables us to see more clearly the principle of equity, and define more distinctly the true boundaries of Individuality, so that we may know when we are intruding on the rightful individualities of others, so far it is useful and important. For though we may not deem it best to insist on our own rights, yet we must not require that others act on the same principle. We must be generous at our own cost, and most certainly must not expect others to be generous to us except at their own option.

It is something—a great deal in fact—to know what we may not do to others; and as a system of negative morality, it is greatly useful. But at the best, it is but the forerunner—the John Baptist—of the divine order. As a constructor, a positive principle, it will have no part in the new dispensation.

I repeat, then, it is in the nature of man that we have made a mistake; and consequently have developed a false philosophy, because it is based upon false premises.

The fact that man is here with certain propensi-

ties and passions, is assumed as proof that he is right in being here and in indulging those propensities. Now I deny the proposition. I challenge the position that because a thing exists in a certain state, it is good that it exist in that state. I do not accept the doctrine of total depravity, as I have understood it; but there is truth enough in the idea of depravity—or perversion, if the term suit you better—to invalidate the soundness of all reasonings based upon discarding it entirely.

And here let me stop a moment, to look a little closer into the merits of our Rationalistic reasoning in regard to the fall of man, depravity, &c. God is all-wise, all-powerful, all-good; too wise not to foresee, too powerful and good not to prevent such a catastrophe. Now granting a God with all the attributes claimed, does it necessarily follow that it were inconsistent with those attributes to permit man to fall? In other words, is it inconsistent with the attributes of Deity to grant man freedom of action—to give him the power of choice as to the course he will pursue? Is that parent (whether human or divine) either unwise or ungood to grant some liberty of action to his children? Were it best that Paradise be surrounded by a Chinese wall, and its inhabitants hampered with a chain and ball, lest they should some time wish to escape? Do we know to a certainty that it were better for anybody that God should govern his children by a continual outlay of restraining power? Even though the difference between his wisdom and theirs were heaven-wide—even though he knew all, and they nothing, of the suffering which would follow, may it not be possible that it were still better that they should learn from their own experience the bitter fruit of the tree of evil? There have been many very smart things said about bungling experimenters, &c., in this connection, and I have doubtless done my share in the saying; but is it sound reasoning after all? The highest dictate of love and wisdom would not require that they be held from retrograde movements, unless, indeed, the consequences of the movement should prove beyond remedy; and I must confess that I cannot see how that amount of freedom of action could be reconciled with the attributes of a perfect Deity. A father might in the highest regard to the weal of a child, permit him to learn the properties of fire by putting his finger into a candle, but he would not allow him to throw himself into a cauldron of scalding water, even if he had to restrain his freedom to prevent it. Individual freedom, within certain limits, is perfectly consistent with the highest attributes of the giver; and as the liability to err is one of the concomitants of freedom, it follows

that there is nothing in the idea of the fall, or a fall, either absurd, ridiculous, or which in any way does violence to our highest and noblest conceptions of Deity. And is not that idea of a fall exemplified in every instance of individual demoralization that occurs in our every-day life? And if such demoralization took place in the father, or fathers, of the race, would not all the race become demoralized and depraved, as a matter of necessity, through the well-known operation of the laws of hereditary descent?

But all this is speculation, you say. You have only proved that it may be as you suppose—that the idea of pre-existence and a fall is not unreasonable; but have adduced nothing to prove that it is really so. What are your reasons?

Well, I believe that man existed in a state of bliss, from which he fell by his own willfulness or disobedience to a lower state, and that he is now cursed by the penalties of that disobedience,—first, because the fact is testified to both by ancient and modern revelation; and secondly, because it accords with my own feelings, or consciousness, to a certain extent. I have ever felt within me the warring of two seemingly diverse natures; and one of the strongest evidences which appeals to my mind of the antemundane origin of man, is the antagonisms existing in my own soul, and the impossibility of bringing my life up to the standard of my desires. The difference between what I am, and what I would be—between my actual and my ideal life, is so great that I can hardly account for it, except by supposing a state of prior perfection, which the soul intuitively feels and compares with its present achievements. Internal consciousness and external revelation, or the testimony of those who profess to have lived long enough to know the fact, given at different periods of the earth's history, then form the only evidence which I can bring in favor of my belief. The first kind of evidence is not in the nature of the case transferable, and the second will not appeal to others with the force with which it does to me.

What then is the use of telling your convictions, when you cannot furnish the evidence on which they are based?

Well, to define my position; to testify to what I believe to be the truth; and to enquire whether you, my radical reader, might not do well to reconsider the soundness of some of your positions, as I have mine. I think it the first duty of an individual who has changed his views on a vital point—vital not only to himself but to all the race, to announce the fact of the change; to say to his friends, I do not think as I once did. The reasonings by which I came to the conclusions I did, are not now satisfactory to me. After announcing the fact of the change, the next duty would seem to be to give as far as he could the reasons for it. This, in a general way, I have attempted to do; though, as I have said, much

of the evidence which was convincing to me was of such a nature, both in its spirituality and its mentality, as not to be transferable to others.

Do you still ask, Why then announce what you cannot give a reason for? I say again, it is the duty of every human being to exert his influence on what he believes to be the side of truth and righteousness. A man is not responsible for not testifying to the absolute truth, only so far as he has knowledge of that truth; but he is responsible for the disposition he evinces to be faithful to his own conception of the truth and the right. And in my own case, if and in so far as I was honest and conscientious in my opposition to the statements and doctrines of the Bible, believing them to be at war with human weal, and that consequently I was under a moral obligation to speak out my thought in denunciation of them,—to at least an equal extent am I morally bound to announce the change, when I become convinced that they are not opposed to human well-being, but that on the contrary humanity is absolutely dependent on the acceptance of those principles for its salvation here and hereafter. If it were manly to avow—nay, if it were base and cowardly not to avow, my disbelief in the Bible when I believed it a stumbling-block in the path of human progress and an incubus upon the souls of men, it were at least as base, as cowardly, as mercenary in me not to avow my faith when I believe that the destiny of the world hangs upon the acceptance of truths therein contained.

Do you still say a change of faith amounts to nothing with a reasoning man unless accompanied with the reasons for the change? Not so, my friend. The simple circumstance of change is itself a new phenomenon, coming within the province of Reason. It is another circumstance, an added fact, and a fact is a great thing in the domain of Reason, and one which it cannot ignore. If I do nothing more than simply change my note, and say to you, I, who once denounced the Bible, now commend it to your earnest consideration; I, who once disbelieved or doubted that such a person as Jesus of Nazareth ever lived, now have full confidence that he not only did live but does live.—I present you with a new fact; and though I do not present the cause, the reason for the fact, it is a fact nevertheless, and though I give not the cause, your reason tells you it must have a cause, and one which is sufficient to produce the effect. There is some cause for every effect. When an individual gets up before a public audience and says, "I desire to testify to the truth of Christianity; I know that my Redeemer liveth," and sits down, adducing no argument but the unsummoned out-flowing tears, Reason is then presented with another fact—a fact which it may explain if it can, but must not ignore. It may philosophize upon it—it may get together all the probabilities, and plausibilities, and possibilities it can bring to bear upon the case, to account for it, but it must not set it aside.

A fact, troublesome though it may be, is not to be set aside as not, because in your opinion it ought not to be. A fact is never out of place. Theories, suppositions, may be out of place—may be erroneous; but facts are never sophistical, never absurd. Dr. Bellows, in his great discourse entitled "The Suspense of Faith," speaks of the phenomenon of the whole Christian world holding fast to its faith in religion, in the face of all the encroachments of science and the peltings of skepticism, as a sublime spectacle. We may differ with him as to the sublimity of the thing, but we cannot differ as to the fact; and that fact is a thing to be accounted for.

Religion may be a very foolish thing, and yet the great fact remains that man is and has been in all ages a religious being; and would it not be as reasonable for the skeptic, one who is not a subject of the superstitious influence, to suppose that there may be a good cause for it, even though the scalpel of science or the crucible of logic fail to reveal it, as to assume that it is all folly and delusion? And does not the latter supposition involve somewhat of absurdity, or inconsistency and incongruity in the management of things, as well as the theories controverted? If man as a whole is persistently devoted to humbugs, believing in ghosts, witches, spirits, and an immortal existence in the next world, when there is in reality neither ghost, spirit, angel, nor a future life; if man everywhere is disposed to revere and offer prayer to one or more Gods, when there is in fact no God in existence,—is it not as much of a blunder on the part of Nature in making him so, as it is on the part of God to create him and then let him fall into retrograde positions? Is not Nature as imperfect in Rationalism as God is in Theology?

I repeat that no fact is unreasonable, and though a faith appear unreasonable, the fact remains the same. An unreasonable faith is a thing to be reasoned upon; and until we do reason upon it, and explain how it is unreasonable, how are we to know that it is unreasonable. "No man," says Martineau, "has a right to say another is ignorant, till he understands his ignorance." Do my friends who deprecate my ignorance understand that ignorance? If not, then how do they know but that my error is truth? Of course no man will change his views simply because another has. That were not reasonable. What I contend for is that it is not unreasonable or improbable to suppose that a man may have good grounds for changing his opinions, though they may not all of them appear.

But no summing up of probabilities can establish the absurd—no amount of testimony can demonstrate the impossible, say you.

Admitted, the absurd is not possible. But it is equally true that nothing which is possible is absurd. And you cannot know that a thing is absurd till you can prove it impossible. Facts are not ridiculous. No truth is absurd. And till you have the means

of knowing that a thing is untrue, you cannot demonstrate and are illogical in assuming its absurdity. No proposition can be absurd, or can be known to be such, whose correctness can neither be proved nor disproved. A thing which is in itself beyond the human reach, cannot be called absurd; and he who assumes to know what cannot be known, is no more absurd than he who assumes to know that the thing assumed cannot be true.

That which is contrary to reason cannot be true; but a thing is not necessarily unreasonable because it is beyond Reason. That which Reason cannot grasp, cannot be known to be unreasonable. Reason can render no verdict, for or against, for it has no jurisdiction in the matter. And here, it seems to me, has been one of our great mistakes. We have undertaken to judge by reason things which were entirely beyond the scope of reason.

But understand me here. I do not discard Reason as depraved. It is good as far as it goes—good anywhere where it has the proper data for action. But in regard to the questions of Deity, or the nature and destiny of man; his beginning or his end; the how, the why, the what, the whence, the whither; his ultimate in either direction, or the relative position that he now sustains in the scale of being, and his relation to the Great Author of being (if, indeed, it have an author); all these momentous, all-important questions, are beyond the province of Reason to settle. They do not, they cannot, come within the scope of his knowledge. He cannot grasp them with his senses. He has no memory of the past, no knowledge of the future. All his senses fail him on these points, for he has no connection with them. He is bounded and limited. His knowledge is confined to that which comes within the scope of his earthly vision. That vision comprehends only the present. It extends neither to the past, nor the future; the cradle bounds it on the one hand, and the grave on the other. He knows nothing of himself, nor the Universe of which he forms a part, except what he can see, hear, and handle. The Universe stands out before him in all its majesty and beauty, a thing of wonderment, not of knowledge. Looking from the human stand-point, it is a maze of mystery—a vast incomprehensible enigma. In vain he gazes; in vain he reasons; in vain he resorts to science. It stands before him from the cradle to the grave, an ever-evolving, ever-receding mystery. All he can do is to gaze and wonder. If he reason the whole round from his own knowledge, he is forced to come back finally to a Godless Universe, and the grave as his home—the end of all that is dear to him. There is where his observation, the analogy of Nature, and the inductions of science, lead him; and the best that a devotee of Reason can say, is, "I don't know anything about it, but I know as much as any other man;" which is at least half true.

If, then, man of himself cannot find out those things which he is most interested as a reflecting

being to know, it follows that he must forever remain in ignorance of them, unless he by some means obtain access to some source of knowledge superior to his own. If he does not of his own knowledge know, and cannot of that knowledge find out, he must ask somebody who does know.

And the question comes home here with an intense importance, Is there such a source of knowledge open to man? I answer, Yes, I believe there is; and it is to a great degree in deference to testimony of this kind that I have changed my views on this subject.

I believe in a future for man, because I have had communications purporting to come from those who have lived here in the form, of such a nature as to establish in my mind the fact of their identity from my previous knowledge of the individuals. I believe, then, in the immortality, or to speak more precisely, the continued existence of the soul, on the testimony of those who have lived after death and given evidence of the fact. My reason never could settle the point of such existence, but it assents to my conclusions. It is not unreasonable to me, but on the contrary is entirely reasonable, and eminently sensible, to take the testimony of those who know more than I do on points which of myself I cannot know.

And so on theological points; the mission of Jesus, &c. I have received the testimony of those who profess to know facts that are beyond the personal knowledge of any now living. I accept the testimony, not against, but in accordance with the dictates of Reason. In this I refer not only to the ancient scriptures, containing the testimony of his cotemporaries, but to more modern revelations, which in all ages, but more especially in this, have been given to the world, from the spiritual and celestial spheres. In those which have come under my own observation, I have not of course established a personal identity from my previous knowledge of them; but I have had enough to convince me of their wisdom and goodness, and for myself I have established their identity (not as individuals, but as a class or school, so to speak,) with those who communicated thousands of years ago; and having established in my own mind the fact of the existence of an over-ruling power, which lives from age to age and marks out to a great extent the destinies of men, together with the fact of accompanying integrity and wisdom, I am bound, as I think, as a reasoning as well as a religious being, to give considerable weight to their testimony. I believe that the same powers that revealed themselves to and in the prophets and apostles of olden times, are now at work on earth in fulfillment of scripture, carrying out a plan and filling out a programme established perhaps before the foundations of the earth were laid. In the fulfillment of that plan, you and I, O human brothers, have a direct interest. In the carrying out of that programme you have a part to play, and it is for you

to say whether you perform it wisely and well, or poorly and imperfectly; and on you will abide the consequences.

I am aware that by thus expressing my belief in a modern revelation coming from the same source as that given of old, I virtually place myself beyond the pale of fellowship from all classes of society. The Materialist will ridicule the idea of any revelation at all, as a relic of barbarism, and proof of religious infancy or imbecility; the Spiritualist will scout such an orthodox revelation as absurd, and hold him who believes it as demented or insane; while the Christian will set it down to the agency of the Devil, and feel a positive assurance, that no good can come out of such a Nazareth.

I have a word to offer to each of these classes.

To the Materialist I will say: The question I propose is one of fact, not of opinion—of evidence, not of speculation; and your business as a lover of truth and a devotee of inductive science, is to abate your theories till you first master the facts. Have you done this? The Spiritualism of to-day is not a matter of ancient history, nor of second-hand narratives only. It appeals to the observation and experience of the present generation. It is based upon facts and phenomena which come home to the senses of all who choose to use them. All who will take the pains to investigate, may have an opportunity to test their theories by facts. Have you done this? If you have—if you have made yourself acquainted with the basic facts, the fundamental phenomena of Spiritualism in all its varying phases, then your opinion is entitled to some weight in the matter. If you have not done this, then you are not qualified to render an intelligent answer; and while you may dogmatize ever so extensively on what you don't know, it isn't well to venture far in the way of positive affirmation.

To the Rational Spiritualist, who shakes his head at big names, and rests in the assumption that as spirits differ among themselves, therefore one story is as good as another, I will remark: So do men differ; and yet truth is ever one and the same. And as some men know much more on some points than other men, so some spirits may know more than others. I would judge of the statements of a spirit as I would judge of those of a man, and place confidence in either in proportion as they had proved themselves worthy of it. Do you doubt that Jesus and the prophets ever lived? So did I. But this, too, is a matter of testimony; and that which with a given amount of evidence appears unreasonable, in the light of additional data becomes entirely acceptable. Great names are not in themselves a proof of either fraud or folly; and though my communicators have been generally nameless, I nevertheless do believe that the Bible personages have a veritable existence. And till the same testimony comes to you that has come to me, I don't see how you can tell whether I am wise or foolish in so believing. I

would say unto you, Wait; it is possible that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in your Harmonial Philosophy. Be patient, and do not dogmatize on that which is confessedly beyond your reach. If Bible miracles and Bible Christianity are based upon moral and spiritual law, as I believe they are, then that law exists to-day, and will some day become known as a matter of science. You do not pretend that you understand the whole scope of mind-force, or spiritual, mesmeric law, so as to define its limits or comprehend the extent of its powers. There are modern miracles, spiritual and mesmeric wonders, which are to yourselves a matter of every-day observation, well-settled facts, which look as incredible perhaps and ridiculous to the skeptical world as the Bible miracles appear to you. May it not possibly prove in the end, that in the one case, as in the other, ignorance is at the bottom of all the incredulity? At any rate, we can lose nothing by a patient waiting, and a modesty in keeping with our positive attainments, in this direction.

Of the Christian I will ask: Is the idea of revelations additional to those given in the Bible either unreasonable in itself or contrary to anything in the Bible? Is not the whole Christian world looking for a coming millenium—a time when "all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest"? And if this is to be, how are they to know him? By what process is the Spirit of the Lord to be poured out upon all flesh? Is it not likely to be by the same law or means by which it was done in Bible times? Is it not true that there has been quite an outpouring of some kind of spirit from some quarter, in these United States, during the past ten or twelve years, under the general term of Spiritualism? And if you do not acquaint yourself with this phenomena, how are you to know but that the claim which is made in its behalf is just; namely, that it bears the distinguishing marks and characteristics of the Spiritualism of the apostolic days—more of these than are to be seen in the popular Christian churches? Bear in mind, if you please, that God's chosen people of old were so wedded to their ancient revelations, that when the new light came they shut their eyes to it, though it was predicted in the very revelations they worshipped. Consequently they rejected the pivotal fact, the corner stone, the very soul of both dispensations, and are to this day looking for that Messiah who made his appearance and was accepted by the Gentile world two thousand years ago. Are you certain, O my Christian friend, that you are better prepared to understand and accept the second coming than the Jews were the first? Do you really believe that the Lord of Heaven is at some time to appear on this earth to gather in his elect, and set up his everlasting kingdom? And if he should do so, are you sure that you would be willing to accept him in his own way, or would you like the Jews find fault with his method of appearing? Do you really love God and his truth better than the desires of your own heart, friends, power, popularity, and your own preconceived opinions? If you do not love truth better than any and all of these—better than all things else, then you have reason to tremble for the fate of your soul; and my parting exhortation to you is, Orient thyself! as you value your own soul, examine your hopes for eternity!

## THE NEW REPUBLIC.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, JUNE 14, 1892.

THE NEW REPUBLIC is published weekly, at one dollar a year; six months, fifty cents; single copies (post paid) three cents.

For sale at No. 288 Superior Street.

Remittances should be made in bills of Ohio, Eastern, Indiana State, or Detroit banks, Treasury notes, coin or stamps. Address,

NEW REPUBLIC,  
CLEVELAND, Ohio.

## Freedom.

The great need of humanity, the great right of humanity, now, is freedom—physical freedom, mental freedom, spiritual freedom; political freedom, religious freedom, social freedom, affectional freedom; and if there is any other kind of freedom, humanity needs that, has a right to that.

But freedom is not understood. The mass of people regard freedom as little else than unlimited license and lawless riot. Political, ecclesiastical and social tyrants and bigots have ever denounced freedom as a promoter of anarchy, and lust, and lawless violence; and the mass of the people have ever feared that if universal freedom were granted, men would trample upon the rights, and disturb the peace of individuals and society. This simply shows that the principle is not understood. Begging the world's pardon, the world doesn't know what freedom is. Freedom does not imply the privilege of trespassing upon rights. To do whatever we please, provided we do not infringe upon any right of any other being, constitutes the sum of human rights. Freedom and rights are therefore one and the same thing; one includes the other. Rights include freedom, are freedom, and freedom cannot clash with rights. The freedom of one is the freedom of all. The moment I trespass in the least degree upon any right of any being, that moment I violate the principle of freedom. When we speak of freedom, therefore, it is always implied, as a part of that freedom, that there is to be no infringement of the rights or freedom of others.

Freedom has been defined to be the "right to do right;" but freedom, to mean anything, must be understood to mean the right to do what we please, always according to others the same right. I must be my own judge of what I will do, or my freedom amounts to nothing. It is one thing to violate the rights of others, and quite another to go contrary to their ideas of propriety, goodness, or purity. Bigots and tyrants in all ages have conceded to mankind the "right to do right," but have always claimed the right to decide what was right. The Pope of Rome is in favor of freedom to do what he approves. The Massachusetts Presbyterians conceded to Roger Williams freedom—to be a Presbyterian. Protestantism is based upon the rights of individual conscience; yet Protestants, as a rule, show very little

toleration towards those who differ from them in opinion. Some social and marriage reformers of the present day are in favor of social and affectional freedom, provided their ideas of propriety and purity are observed. What we demand for humanity is the right to judge for themselves as to what is best for them to do, independent of all arbitrary interference whatever.

What I mean by freedom is exemption from outside interference. There is no such thing as exemption from the operation of the laws of our own being. These laws are a part of us, and when we violate them, in other words, when we violate ourselves, there is no atonement except in suffering for such violation. There is no freedom to do wrong without suffering for that wrong. We acknowledge the authority of the laws of our being, and are willing to accept the consequences when we violate them; but we deny to any authority under heaven, aside from our own judgment and conscience, the right to dictate what we shall do, or what we shall not do, so long as we do not interfere with the freedom of others. How is it that men have not a right to judge for themselves what is right, and yet are considered perfectly competent to judge for other people? Would it not seem to be the more consistent, sensible and economical plan for every man to look after his own conduct, mind his own business, and leave his neighbors to mind theirs? It has been said that people sometimes get rich by minding their own business; certain it is that he secures the most spiritual riches, who spends the greater part of his time in attending to his own affairs, looking after his own conduct, and in efforts to build up for himself a manly, worthful character. It is time that people had learned that they are only responsible for their own acts. I believe it is generally admitted that we are in more danger of being damned for our own sins than for the sins of our neighbors. Would it not be better to act more in accordance with this idea? But mankind have always been even ludicrously intent on the salvation of their neighbors. So anxious have they been for their salvation, that they have even been willing to force them to do right; not to be true to their own consciences, however, but to do what their neighbors approved! However commendable the spirit of those who are so anxious that their neighbors should go to heaven that they attempt to drive them there, it must be admitted that their efforts are more philanthropic than wise. People cannot be driven into goodness. There is no merit in any act that is not prompted by an inner desire to do right. The only possible way to make people better, and really improve their conduct, is by improving their character; by throwing around them the right influences, calling out the innate desire that exists in every human heart, for the good, the pure, and the beautiful; thus making them good; knowing that a pure fountain, no matter how freely it flows, cannot send forth muddy



water; that a good tree cannot bring forth corrupt fruit; and that it is impossible to make thorns and thistles produce figs and grapes by any forceful means. The stream cannot rise higher than its source. The conduct of men can never be better than their character. If the fountain sends forth muddy water, the fountain must be purified; it will do no good to dam up the stream; for its waters will either force away the obstruction and flow on in their natural channel, or overflow its banks, and spread impurity over what otherwise had been useful and beautiful.

### Institutions.

People have great reverence for institutions; more reverence for institutions than for humanity; or justice; or human rights; or human happiness. I confess that for one, I have no especial reverence for institutions. Everything is to be revered, appreciated, according to its character, in proportion to its worth, as a promoter of human happiness and human good. Everything is good in its place. I reverence the clothes that I wore when I was a child; but I should protest against being compelled to wear those clothes now, that I have outgrown them. It would be no more absurd to attempt to compel the man to wear his childhood's clothes, than to compel the people of the present or a future age, to adopt, and live by, the institutions of a barbarous age, that have been handed down to us.

The institutions, and systems, and customs, that were adopted in the comparative infancy of the race, were, doubtless, the very best, that that condition of development could devise; but they are not, nevertheless, adapted to man's nature, and ideas, and needs, in his present condition of unfoldment. Institutions are stationary, while man is progressive; hence the ever recurring need that institutions be modified or abolished. But I would have no institution abolished arbitrarily; except so far as it involved a direct and flagrant outrage upon human rights. But I would demand a recognition of the eternal fact of human progress; and I would demand for humanity the right to outgrow existing institutions, and to adopt others more in accordance with present ideas and needs.

And herein is the contest between Radicalism and Conservatism. Radicalism asserts the principle of human progress, and demands for humanity the right to act accordingly—the right to change and modify their customs and practices, in accordance with the changes in character, and need, and aspiration, which this progress implies; while, on the other hand, Conservatism asserts the essential validity, and legitimacy, and permanency, and finality of existing institutions, no matter in what ignorant or infantile ages of the world they were established, and discourages, and frowns upon, and even, where it has the power, punishes, all attempts to ignore or to modify what is established. One of two things

is certain—either man is not a progressive being, or, the institutions of any age are not necessarily adapted to succeeding ages. One of two things we must do—either ignore and deny the principle of progress, or, cease to contend for the infallibility of institutions.

### Literary Notices.

**THE INVESTIGATOR.**—We copy from the columns of this able and fearless journal, an exceedingly appreciative notice of the **NEW REPUBLIC**, for which its conductors have our hearty thanks.

Its criticism, to one who has always regarded Jesus Christ as a literal personage, and a heroic and self-sacrificing advocate of the sublimest and most saving truths; and who is, at the same time, never shocked by the expression of any honest sentiment, however differing from his own, is quite amusing. The idea that the only fault to be found with the **NEW REPUBLIC** is its endorsement of Jesus Christ, is, in the light of commonly accepted ideas, enough to call a smile to the face of even a care-worn Editor!

We cannot help liking the Investigator for its honest boldness, and ability, but we must express the opinion that it is a little behind the **NEW REPUBLIC** in not being a Christian journal. Now we do not know that there was ever such a man as Jesus, nor, as we elsewhere say, do we think it a vital point to decide; nor, admitting his existence, do we know that he was a good man, but are inclined, from what to us seems evidence, to decide both questions in the affirmative. Whether Jesus actually lived or not, does not greatly matter; the all-saving principles he is supposed by some to have advocated, are eternal, and have been embodied in the lives of thousands of the noble and the loving of earth. Thousands of brave men and women have lived and died for humanity, and through such living and death have not only exerted a saving influence on those around them, but have themselves thus risen into a glorious Individuality, not otherwise attained; it is of comparatively little account whether one called Jesus was among them.

While the Investigator is too negative and destructive to meet our highest ideal, yet many of our readers who regard us as too pious, would like it all the better for that. We hope always to sustain the most friendly relations to all such journals. See Prospectus.

**THE HERALD OF PROGRESS.**—It is with pleasure that we place in our columns the Prospectus of this journal; the best and ablest of its class. This we can honestly say, and yet leave room for hearty and honest praise of other journals. In point of ability some of its Editors stand in the first rank. The Herald of Progress has one rare merit—it is not devoted to any one idea. We pray it may have a long life and multiplied usefulness.

**THE HARBINGER OF HEALTH.**—We have before referred to this able work. No family should be without it. See advertisement.

**THE PROGRESSIVE ANNUAL.**—This excellent little work is filled with choice selections, showing the most discriminating taste, and contains a great variety of information interesting to Reformers. It is well worth its price. See advertisement.

### A Reform Paper.

"THE NEW REPUBLIC" is the name of a periodical or magazine which has lately been commenced at Cleveland, (Ohio.) It is quite a neat looking publication, typographically, and being printed in sixteen large octavo pages, is in a convenient shape for binding. It is cheap, too—\$1 a year—too cheap, we fear, to be long lived. Yet we wish it might be successful, for its object is a good one—namely,

"To combine an earnest and energetic radicalism with a wise conservatism. It will advocate all rational reforms, and seek to promote a greater unity of feeling, and concert of action, and comprehensiveness of view, among all classes of reformers. It will take sides with no party, and will never be involved in personal or party quarrels, of any kind, or in any degree. So far as it acknowledges and follows leadership, Jesus Christ will be its standard in morals, and Thomas Jefferson in politics. It will advocate a reconstruction in our Government so far as to allow of a settlement of the Slavery question in such a manner as not to involve the sacrifice of justice, freedom, human rights, a sound policy and the Nation's safety, on the one hand, or unconstitutional and despotic methods on the other. It will advocate a radical revolution in politics and governmental administration, so far as there has been a departure from the Jeffersonian Platform, and systematic and persistent violation of the fundamental principles of the Government. It will be an especial advocate of simplicity and economy in Government, and attempt to demonstrate the correctness of the doctrine that 'that government is best that governs least.' It will advocate a uniform and national system of currency, a uniform and humane system of prison discipline, uniform marriage and divorce laws, a new and improved system of representation, and present suggestive ideas on the subject of schools, internal improvements, post-office regulations, &c. It will also give the thoughts of the ablest writers on Anthropology and Physiological science. It will not aim to be a news-paper, but will note and comment upon, the World's progress, and the leading events of the times."

This is an excellent platform, with the exception of the reference to "Jesus Christ." Not that we oppose anything he taught which was morally good, but the truth is Jesus was a religionist, who provided salvation only for those who believed as he did, and he made his morals square with his religion. "I pray not for the world," said he, "but for these my disciples." And again he says, "I am not sent save unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Now we respectfully submit to our Cleveland friend that the morality based upon this religion, (and of course the former is subsidiary to, or shaped by, the latter,) is not at all appropriate for a Reform journal which professes to maintain equal rights and privileges. Neither is it consistent with "the politics of Thomas Jefferson,"—that great American apostle of universal mental liberty. Neither is it desirable in a new republic. If we are to have a new one, let there be in it no slavery of the mind any more than of the body. Let no followers of "Jesus Christ," nor of any other religionist, be entitled to any exclusive

rights or privileges; but let all be equal before the law and the State, not because they "follow" this or that religion, but simply because they are human beings. This is in accordance with the morality of Reason and Nature, which is superior to that taught by the man of Nazareth; and as we want the "New Republic" to have the best, we suggest this improvement.

But even if our advice should not be taken, we shall still hope that our Cleveland friend may be successful in his very laudable attempt to establish a paper on the basis of free thought and free speech. This principle always deserves success, and we respect the man who has the moral courage to labor in its behalf.—[Boston Investigator.

### What We Want and What We Don't Want.

We want working men and women; those who when they have discovered a principle to be right will put it in practice; who are not ashamed to walk in the right path although obliged to stop and clear away the rubbish. We do not want the men, or women, who stand by with folded arms, waiting for some back to bear the burden, but ready to partake of the benefits which may be the result. We do not want friends swarming around us when the sun shines, who will leave us as soon as the storm comes. We want men and women stamped with the image of God, who are not ashamed of the impress. We want the man who is able to make any labor respectable; whose ungloved hands show that he is not ashamed of his calling. We want the woman who dare step out of the paths of fashion and untrammel her limbs, knowing that she will be scoffed at and scorned for so doing. There are thousands of lives laid upon the altar of fashion, that are capable of being moulded into something beautiful and useful. Fashion has left isolated hearthstones, and placed the canker worm in the heart of thousands of her votaries. The soul's warmest affections are chilled by contact with her. We want men and women who are able to live above the law; whose souls worship at Nature's shrine.

C. M. STOWE.

Independence, Iowa, May 31, '62.

### A Criticism.

MR. EDITOR:—I have read with a good deal of interest, each No. of the NEW REPUBLIC. Much of it I can endorse, and, as is natural, some of it I cannot. Included in the latter, is the Editorial article headed "The Result," in the REPUBLIC of May 24.

I would not be considered as fault-finding, but I wish, in my way, to say a few words in regard to the gloomy picture therein portrayed.

Your remarks upon Mr. Overton's gloomy letter

to the New York Reform Conference, seemed to be eminently just and pertinent. Let me quote: "We most respectfully protest against the depreciating spirit Mr. Overton exhibits. In looking back over the history of the Planet, and viewing the progress that has been made, and calculating the future by the past, there would seem to be occasion for reverent gladness and joyous hopefulness, rather than dissatisfaction." And might you not have added, or of fearful foreboding of the future—that men and women must "wade through blood and horror."

While there are in the North, great and crying wrongs being perpetrated by the strong and wealthy upon the weak and poor, and fashion raises its hydra head, and clutches in its fangs its million victims, and intemperance and licentiousness, like the Simoon sweep o'er the land, yet I can read nothing in the history of the past, or see in the "signs of the times" of the present, to give rise to such fearful forebodings.

The people of the North are preeminently a law and order abiding people, and as true republicans have ever submitted to the voice of the majority.

There is not a single question, excepting that of Slavery, that has been agitated in this Nation, at least that the North have been immediately interested in, but what has resulted, without bloodshed, in a gain of something on the side of justice and humanity.

All the great Reforms that now agitate the North on mind, are gradually and peacefully, through the ballot box, triumphing over every obstacle that impedes their progress.

Look at the various Reforms. Land Reform, Prison Reform, Social Reform, Dress Reform, Reform in medicine, morals and religion, and see what rapid strides they have made in the last twenty-five years.

Upon what ground, Mr. Editor, you predicate the thought, that as soon as this contest of blood with the South is ended, it will be removed to the North, I cannot perceive.

It seems to me that there need be, can be, no bloodshed, when all questions are so freely discussed and agitated.

I believe that had the question of Negro Slavery been freely agitated in the States where it exists, it would ere this have been in the way of peaceful extinction.

I think it may be laid down as a rule, that where all questions of difference, and of reform, can be discussed and agitated in a spirit of toleration, a peaceful solution will be the result. But where discussion is suppressed, and questions of justice and

humanity are involved, bloodshed must be the result; for

"Ever the Right comes uppermost,  
And ever is Justice done!"

It seems to me, Mr. Editor, that the gloomy picture you present your readers, cannot be the logical deduction from the lessons of the past, or the signs of the times of the present.

Your picture of blood and horror is very clearly set forth, but the course to pursue to avert this threatening doom and destruction, is not so clear.

You say "the entire ignoring of party spirit, and a cultivation of a fraternal feeling, alone can save us." This is all very plain, and I heartily endorse it as being all potent to prevent all the evils that threaten our beautiful North. But the following is not so clear: "Weak and fanatical as it may appear to the worldly wise, Christ, through the spirit he shall infuse into the hearts of such as embrace his salvation, shall yet save our beloved Nation from the destruction to which it will, ere long, seem hopelessly doomed."

I may be one of the "worldly wise" and unable to see just how Christ is going to save this doomed land, but you say he will do it, and I may be pardoned if I ask an explanation of how it is to be done.

It seems that he will do it "through the spirit he shall infuse into the hearts of such as embrace his salvation." What his salvation is you fail to tell. Is it the salvation advocated by the Presbyterian, Baptist, Universalist, or Mormon? Which of the numerous ways of salvation is Christ's? and who are those who embrace his salvation? In what manner does he infuse his spirit? and how can we tell whether it is the spirit of Christ or Satan that is being infused? It is a question yet whether either ever had a real existence. If they have, and Christ be God, as those who believe in him say, Satan is the better person of the two.

It seems to be the merest twaddle to talk about the salvation of this country being dependent upon the will or caprice of Christ or "any other man."

I venture to say that should all who believe in Christ and a way of salvation through him, preach what he preached and practiced, as recorded in the New Testament, it would inaugurate a condition of things in this land far worse than that foreshadowed in the article under review.

This criticism and these questions may seem impertinent, but I make them because, first, I do not believe the calamity you foreshadow can possibly occur to this country, and second, if it does as you say, in what sense do you wish to be understood that Christ is to save it? In the sense that the Church

believe Christ is to save the world? or in that enlightened sense, that Christ, or the good of all ages shall inspire men and women to be more loving and charitable and fraternal towards each other? If the latter why clothe your thought in language that can have none other than a double meaning?

Yours truly, A. C. STOWE.

Independence, Iowa, May 29, '62.

#### REMARKS.

I am not disposed to discuss the leading question involved in my friend's criticism. I only hope that he is right and that I am wrong. Nothing would make me happier than to be disappointed, and proved a false prophet. Our friend has however fallen into the too common error of over-stating the propositions he attempts to refute. The article in question contains little more in the way of prediction, than expressions of fear of certain results, not so much of positive assertion as the foregoing strictures would seem to imply. I would not wish to paint gloomy pictures. I believe in a glorious future for our Nation and the race. This terrible ordeal is but the initiation of higher and better conditions. The contemplation of whatever may be necessary to the destruction of the old and the establishment of the new, should inspire courage and hope instead of gloom. The case of Mr. Overton is not parallel, for the reason that he seemed to see in the present state of things no especial indication of a brighter and better future.

The very worst that could have been predicted is already a matter of fact, so far as half of the States are concerned. And to thousands of Northern hearts are not the realities of the hospital and battle-field now coming home? Are we sure that the land will not yet be filled with mourning for lost husbands, fathers, sons and brothers? Do we know but that crafty, heartless monarch, Louis Napoleon, with direst evil in his heart, may plot with jealous, revengeful England for our overthrow? Is it certain that the complication of affairs such an event would involve, would not result in a state of things, to us somewhat serious? It is not wise on the one hand, to be discouraged by any prospect, or on the other to blind our eyes to what unpleasant events may transpire, and which should if possible be guarded against.

Our friend says that Slavery is the only question that has been agitated that has resulted in bloodshed. This is true. But the agitation of this question has resulted in bloodshed; and the question is not by any means settled yet. Is it supposed that the calamity that has befallen our country, is a mere accident, or is it the natural result of a long continued course of injustice and outrage? And is the

North less guilty in the matter than the South? If not, is it to be expected that she will fail to receive her share of the reward? I think not.

But the great query in the mind of our correspondent is, in case matters are as bad as may be, how Christ is going to help them. The question was answered in the article referred to, namely, "Through the spirit he shall infuse into the hearts of such as embrace his salvation;" or in other words are susceptible to his influence; or in the language of our correspondent, by "inspiring men and women to be more loving and charitable and fraternal towards each other."

A rational construction should be put upon language when it will admit of it; and in the absence of any reason for giving it an irrational one.

It does seem a little remarkable that a teacher of Spiritualism, who of course must make considerable account of spiritual impressions, should be querying how to distinguish between Christ and Satan! But if we are inspired to be "more loving and charitable and fraternal," it will, I think, be safe to conclude that they emanate from some good source. It is a pretty good rule to judge of the source by the emanations—of the tree by its fruits.

I do not hold that the salvation of the Country or the World, depends upon any individual; nor do I consider the question of the existence of Christ a vitally important one—Salvation depends upon the practical acceptance of eternal principles—but it is my opinion that such a person as Jesus did live, that he was eminently good, and exerted a commanding influence on those around him. I also believe that those who have lived on earth, and passed into another state of existence, still feel an interest in mundane affairs, and exert a modifying not to say controlling influence over the affairs of mortals. The statement that the adoption of Christ's theories and practices, would result in anarchy and bloodshed, is, it seems to me, rather extravagant. That the New Testament account is imperfect, and even contradictory, must be admitted, but weight of testimony seems to be in favor of his remarkable manhood, bravery and devotion to principle. Esteem, reverence, confidence, are due to the good, and true, and brave, everywhere, in whatever sphere; and their lives are prolific of salvation, but on the Eternal Laws hang all destinies.

#### New Series by Prof. Powell.

From the numerous expressions of interest in Dr. Powell's articles, that have come from our readers, we judge that they will be pleased to learn that we are to commence, next week, a series of articles from his pen, on "The Protection of Society from Crime." A good time to get up clubs.

## PROSPECTUS

OF THE

## NEW REPUBLIC.

At a time so momentous as the present, there is an imperative demand for the exercise of all the wisdom, heroism, self-sacrifice, charity, and the forgetting of all past differences, and the sinking of all worldly ambition, in one sublime, prayerful, determined, brotherly effort to save our beloved country from the terrible ruin that more than threatens to swallow up our liberties, prosperity, peace. How to conquer the rebels, is not all of the great problem that must be settled before there is any certainty that we, as a Nation, have anything in the future to hope for.

The NEW REPUBLIC has two leading and distinctive objects: First, by humble and modest, but earnest and thorough effort, to promote, to the fullest extent of its ability, that fraternity of feeling among all parties and classes of society, on which our salvation so vitally depends. Second, to discuss, in a free, untrammelled manner, but in no partisan, dogmatical or dictatorial spirit, all of those fundamental and practical questions and principles of Government and human rights which the adjustment of our National politics will involve.

Society is divided into three distinct and leading classes. The Radical Reformer, the Liberal Conservative, and the opponent of Progress. The tendencies of the times are toward a union of the first two classes. No radical reform or idea has been advocated, but has embodied an important, though possibly mixed and partial truth. The agitation of single reforms, has been useful mainly in the way of preparing the public mind for a comprehensive understanding and thorough adjustment of the great political and social questions that lie at the basis of our National happiness and well-being. The law of extremes and equilibrium is a universal law. Extremisms in reform have been necessary to balance the opposite extreme of stationary conservatism. The illustration has been that of extremes; the tendency now is toward equilibrium.

The aim of the NEW REPUBLIC will be to combine an earnest and energetic radicalism with a wise conservatism. It will advocate all rational reforms, and seek to promote a greater unity of feeling, and concert of action, and comprehensiveness of view, among all classes of reformers. It will take sides with no party, and will never be involved in personal or party quarrels, of any kind, or in any degree. So far as it acknowledges and follows leadership, Jesus Christ will be its standard in morals, and Thomas Jefferson in politics. It will advocate a reconstruction in our Government so far as to allow of a settlement of the Slavery question in such a manner as not to involve the sacrifice of justice, freedom, human rights, a sound policy and the Nation's safety, on the one hand, or unconstitutional and despotic methods on the other. It will advocate a radical revolution in politics and governmental administration, so far as there has been a departure from the Jeffersonian Platform, and systematic and persistent violation of the fundamental principles of the Government. It will be an especial advocate of simplicity and economy in Government, and attempt to demonstrate the correctness of the doctrine that "that Government is best that governs least." It will advocate a uniform and national system of currency, a uniform and humane system of prison discipline, uniform marriage and divorce laws, a new and improved system of representation, and present suggestive ideas on the subject of schools, internal improvements, post-office regulations &c. It will also give the thoughts of the

ablest writers on Anthropological and Physiological science.

It will not aim to be a news-paper, but will note and comment upon, the World's progress, and the leading events of the times.

TERMS: At the rate of one dollar a year for any length of time. Address,

NEW REPUBLIC,  
Cleveland, O.

## Reform Journals.

We propose, as a token of fraternal appreciation, and for the convenience of our readers, to keep standing in our columns, for a few weeks, the following list (which may be enlarged from time to time) of Reform Journals.

## BANNER OF LIGHT.

A large weekly journal, devoted to Spiritualism and Reform literature.—Luther Colby Editor. Two dollars a year. Address, Banner of Light, Boston, Mass.

## LIBERATOR.

A leading Garrisonian journal—free for the discussion of all subjects.—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Editor. Two dollars and fifty cents a year. 221 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

## INVESTIGATOR.

Infidel journal.—Horace Seaver, Editor. Two dollars a year. 103 Court St., Boston, Mass.

## PINE AND PALM.

Anti-Slavery.—James Redpath, Editor. Two dollars a year. Address, Boston, Mass.

## ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

National Organ of the Garrisonian Abolitionists. Two dollars a year. No. 48 Beekman St., New York.

## HERALD OF PROGRESS.

Devoted to the Harmonial Philosophy, and general Reform.—Andrew Jackson Davis, Editor. Two dollars a year. 274 Canal St., New York.

## THE PRINCIPIA.

A religious Anti-Slavery journal. William Goodell, Editor. Two dollars a year. 104 William St., New York.

## THE CIRCULAR.

Organ of the Oneida Perfectionists.—One dollar a year, or free. Address, Circular, Oneida, N. Y.

## THE SIBYL.

Devoted to Dress and other Reforms.—Dr. Lydia Sayer Hasbrouck, Editor. Fifty cents a year. Address, Middletown, Orange Co., N. Y.

## THE PROGRESSIVE AGE.

Monthly. Fifty cents a year. Hopedale, Mass.

## THE MAYFLOWER.

Devoted to the Interests of Woman.—Miss Lizzie Bunnell, Editor. Semi-Monthly. Fifty cents a year. Peru, Ind.

## RISING TIDE.

Spiritualistic. Monthly. Seventyfive cents a year. Independence, Iowa.

# THE HERALD OF PROGRESS,

**ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS, Editor,**

Assisted by an Association of Able Writers and  
Correspondents.

A Cosmopolitan Journal of Health, Progress and Reform, devoted to no Sect, belonging to no Party, not given to one idea. The attention of all Reformatory, Progressive, and Spiritual minds is invited to the following distinctive features of

## THE HERALD OF PROGRESS:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS,

MEDICAL WHISPERS,

AND PRESCRIPTIONS

BY THE EDITOR,

VOICES FROM THE PEOPLE,

TEACHINGS OF NATURE,

*Doings of the "Moral Police,"*

SPIRITS MYSTERIES,

TIDINGS FROM THE INNER LIFE,

PULPIT AND ROSTRUM,

BROTHERHOOD,

CHILDHOOD,

LAWS AND SYSTEMS.

Also, choice Poetry and attractive Miscellany, embracing translations from the French and German; faithful historical portraiture, life sketches of notable persons, late improvements in science and art, news, &c., &c.

## THE HERALD OF PROGRESS

is published every SATURDAY, on a folio of eight pages, for Two Dollars per annum, or One Dollar for six months, payable in advance. To Clubs, three copies to the same post office, \$5; Ten Copies, \$16; Twenty Copies, \$30.

We shall be glad to receive the names of all persons who would be likely to subscribe.

Specimen copies sent free. Address,

A. J. DAVIS & Co.,

274 Canal St., N. Y.

A full assortment of PROGRESSIVE BOOKS kept constantly on hand.

Agent for Boston,

BELA MARSH, 14 Bromfield street.

THE

## PROGRESSIVE ANNUAL,

FOR

**Eighteen Hundred and Sixty-Two,**

Comprising an Almanac, a Spiritual Register, and a General Calendar of Reform.

Published at the office of "The Herald of Progress."

A. J. DAVIS & Co.,

No. 274 Canal Street,

New York.

Price 15 cts. 10 Copies for \$1.

[FIFTH EDITION NOW READY.]

**A Book for Every Household.**

THE

## HARBINGER OF HEALTH,

Containing

## MEDICAL PRESCRIPTIONS,

FOR THE

## HUMAN BODY AND MIND.

By **ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS,**

Formerly known as "The Poughkeepsie Clairvoyant and Seer."

Just published, a new and rare volume, designed as a popular Handbook of Health, adapted for use in the family, hospital and camp. The work contains more than

## Three Hundred Prescriptions

for the treatment and cure of over one hundred different diseases and forms of disease incident to this climate.

The Author's Prescriptions are given in the light of the "Superior Condition," a state in which every organ and function of the human system is transparently disclosed, with the most appropriate remedy for the greatest variety of cases.

The Harbinger of Health cannot fail to awaken intense interest in the minds of the most intelligent of the Medical Profession, and will prove invaluable to the general reader, containing, as it does, information concerning methods of treatment hitherto unknown to the world, and imparting important suggestions respecting the

## SELF-HEALING ENERGIES,

which are better than medicine.

It is a plain simple guide to health, with no quackery, no humbug, no universal panacea.

## Sent by Mail for One Dollar.

Published and for sale at the office of the Herald of Progress, 274 Canal Street, New York.

Four hundred and twenty-eight pages, 12mo, good paper and well bound. Price only One Dollar! A liberal discount to the trade.

Single copies mailed free on receipt of price. Eighteen cents additional required, if sent to California and Oregon.

Address A. J. DAVIS & CO., Publishers,

274 Canal St., N. Y.

S. S. BARRIE, Cleveland.

D. P. BEDELL, New York.

S. S. BARRIE & CO.,

DEALERS IN

**COAL OIL LAMPS, AND CARBON OIL,**

**No. 116 Bank St., --- Cleveland, Ohio.**

Not to be undersold by any House in the United States.

**YOUR ORDERS ARE SOLICITED.**

**J. L. LOVELL,  
CLAIRVOYANT PHYSICIAN.  
TESTIMONIALS.**

—o—  
This is to certify, that in June, 1858, I received an injury in the foot by jumping from a horse, and, after being under the treatment of six of our most scientific physicians without receiving any benefit, and suffering much pain—being unable to walk—in June, 1860, through the influence of a friend, I put myself under the treatment of Dr. J. L. Lovell, of Yarmouth, Me. I did not think he would succeed any better than the former physicians, but as my friend had been benefitted by him, I could but try, and in a short time I found I could walk. I took no medicine. The lameness caused other difficulties, but now I am free from all suffering and enjoy good health. Any one wishing for further information can receive it by calling on me, or by writing to me.

MARGARET B. FLANDERS.

SOUTH GARDINER, Nov. 20, 1860.

—o—  
This is to certify that I have been troubled with the bleeding, blind, and itching Piles for twenty-six years. I have consulted a number of physicians, but found no relief until last Spring I commenced taking Dr. J. L. Lovell's medicine, and in three weeks I was relieved, and am now enjoying good health. I would recommend all that are troubled with Piles to call and see Dr. J. L. Lovell.

MARTIN WARD.

YARMOUTH, Nov. 20, 1860.

—o—  
This is to certify that having been afflicted with Disease of the Liver for twelve years, and having other complaints combined with that, I placed myself under the care of Dr. J. L. Lovell, of Yarmouth, Mo., in January, 1859, and received great benefit from him; being so much relieved within a few months, that I could lie upon my left side, which I had not done during that time.

AMANDA ESTES.

STEVENS' PLAINS, Oct. 2, 1860.

—o—  
This is to certify that we, the undersigned, having been under the treatment of L. J. Lovell, Clairvoyant Physician, do cheerfully recommend him to all invalids, both as a physician and a gentleman.

MRS. GEO. BICKFORD,  
MARGARET T. PERRY,  
ELENOR HUNTER,  
IZETTA PREBLE,  
HANNAH WARD,  
ANN WARE,  
IRENA ADERTON,  
HARRIET N. LINNEKEN.

BLOOMSD, Oct. 19, 1860.

—o—  
Examination and Prescription \$1.—Terms Cash.

J. L. LOVELL,

Yarmouth, Me.

**NEW SERIES OF TRACTS**


PUBLISHED BY THE

**AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,**

ARE TO BE OBTAINED AT THE

Anti-Slavery office, 48 Beekman street, New York; 106 North-Tenth street, Phila.; and 221, Washington street, Boston.

- No. 1. Correspondence between Lydia Maria Child and Governor Wise and Mrs. Mason, of Virginia. 5 cents.
- No. 2. Victor Hugo on American Slavery, with letters of other distinguished individuals, viz., De Tocqueville, Mazzini, Humboldt, Lafayette, &c., &c. 5 cents.
- No. 3. An Account of some of the Principle Slave Insurrections during the last two centuries. By Joshua Collins. 5 cents.
- No. 4. The New Reign of Terror in the Slaveholding States, for 1839--'60. 10 cents.
- No. 5. Daniel O'Connell on American Slavery; with other Irish Testimonies. 5 cents.
- No. 6. The Right Way the Safe Way, proved by Emancipation in the West Indies, and elsewhere. By L. Maria Child. 10 cents.
- No. 7. Testimonies of Capt. John Brown, at Harper's Ferry, with his address to the Court. 2 cents.
- No. 8. The Philosophy of the Abolition Movement. By Wendell Phillips. 5 cents.
- No. 9. The Duty of Disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Act; An Appeal to the Legislature of Massachusetts. By L. Maria Child. 5 cents.
- No. 10. The Infidelity of Abolitionism. By Wm. Lloyd Garrison. 3 cents.
- No. 11. Speech of John Hossack convicted of violation of the Fugitive Slave Act, at Chicago, Illinois. 3 cents.
- No. 12. The Patriarchal Institution, as described by Members of its Own Family. Compiled by L. Maria Child. 5 cents.
- No. 13. No Slave-Hunting in the Old Bay State: An Appeal to the People and Legislature of Massachusetts. 5 cents.
- No. 14. A Fresh Catalogue of Southern Outrages upon Northern Citizens. 10 cents.
- No. 15. The Fugitive Slave Law and its Victims. By Rev. Samuel May, Jr. Revised and enlarged edition. 13 cents single, \$10 a hundred.
- No. 16. Tribute of William Ellery Channing to the American Abolitionists, for their Vindication of Freedom of Speech. 2 cents.
- No. 17. Argument of Wendell Phillips Against the Repeal of the Personal Liberty Law, before the Committee of the Legislature, Jan. 29, 1861. 5 cents.
- No. 18. A Voice from Harper's Ferry. A Narrative of Events at Harper's Ferry: with incidents prior and subsequent to its capture by Captain John Brown and his men. By Osborne P. Anderson, one of the number. 15 cents.
- No. 19. The Abolition of Slavery the Right of the Government under the War Power. 5 cents.
- No. 20. The Loyalty and Devotion of Colored Americans in the Revolution and War of 1812. 5 cents.
- No. 21. In Memoriam. Testimonials to the Life and Character of the late Francis Jackson. 5 cents.

 A deduction of fifty per cent. will be made when a dozen or more copies are taken. Gratuitous copies will be sent by mail, for examination, on receiving the postage charge.

A GENERAL PROSPECTUS  
OF  
**THE BOSTON INVESTIGATOR.**  
VOLUME XXXII.

The cause of Universal Mental Liberty, which seeks to establish the claims and teachings of Nature and Reason, and to overthrow those of Superstition, Bigotry, and Priestcraft, still needs the support of a free and independent press.

We have no new principles to proclaim, and hence we shall keep to the old landmarks by which we have so long been guided, endeavoring as far as we are able to render the paper acceptable to all and subservient to national utility. Believing superstition to be the bane of human improvement—the moral leprosy of mankind—our most especial object shall be, as it hitherto has been, to counteract its pernicious influence, and to expose, by every means in our power, the mischievous practice of that numerous class of pretenders who are perpetually directing the attention of their credulous followers to things above, that they may the more effectually deprive them of things below, and attempting to reconcile them to misery and degradation in this world, by promising them happiness and honor in another.

Anti-religious, then, and anti-clerical, in connection with universal mental freedom, are the distinguishing characteristics of the INVESTIGATOR. But as our aim is the promotion of human happiness by means of mental cultivation, we shall enrich our columns with whatever we may deem conducive thereto. We shall therefore present to our readers whatever we may find valuable in literature, art, or science. As we pretend not to amuse the idle or soothe the ignorant, we shall have no pretty tales of mystery, to excite the imagination at the expense of the understanding; we shall, nevertheless, as much as possible, associate amusement with utility. In a word, we shall do the best we know how to render our paper deserving of the patronage we solicit, and worthy of the cause we advocate.

To the friends who have hitherto stood by us, and who have kindly tendered their further assistance, we return our most grateful acknowledgments; and we call upon every one of congenial thought and feeling to countenance and support us in our uncompromising hostility to religious imposture, which we consider the master-vice of the age.

The INVESTIGATOR being the only paper published in the known world which takes the broad ground of freely investigating all subjects, moral, social, and religious, we ask of those who are opposed to superstition, to religious cant and intolerance, to lead us their aid in extending its circulation.

**TERMS**—Two dollars per annum for a single copy; three dollars for two copies to one address. All letters should be directed to

J. P. MENDUM,  
No. 103 Court St.,  
Boston, Mass.

S P I R I T U A L I S M .

S. L. McFADDEN & LADY,  
*CLAIRVOYANT*

**HEALING AND TEST MEDIUMS,**

Have taken Rooms at

**No. 55 Euclid St., South Side Public Square,  
SECOND FLOOR,**

Where they may be consulted in reference to all diseases to which the human family is heir.

They will, by their peculiar clairvoyant powers, accurately describe disease, and successfully prescribe for the same, without any previous knowledge of the patient. Tests of various kinds will also be given to satisfy the most incredulous.

Come one! come all! and be satisfied of the communion of Spirits—the Life Everlasting—the truths of the Bible—and the immortality of the soul.

**CHARGES IN ALL CASES MODERATE.**

Cleveland, Ohio, May 15th, 1862.

**The Fugitive Wife.**

A NEW AND INTERESTING BOOK.

BY WARREN CHASE.

BELA MARSH has just published an interesting work, written by WARREN CHASE, author of "The Life Line of the Lone One," the title of which is "THE FUGITIVE WIFE;" being a Review, Criticism, and Commentary on Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce, Polygamy, Monogamy, Celibacy, and Free Love, Shakerism, Communism, and Socialism. Interspersed with Poems, Sketches of Actual Life, as seen by the author during many years travels, with proposed legal remedies for domestic troubles.

Price, in paper binding, 25 cents; in cloth, 40 cents,—sent by mail.

Published and for sale by

**BELA MARSH,**

14 Bromfield St., Boston.

And by the Author.

**To the Diseased.**

There are persons in all parts of the country who need medical advice and council in relation to their physical health, and the relation and influence of mind thereto. Those in Spirit life, in Mediumistic connection with those in earth life, (who, for years have made disease and its treatment a study) are prepared to impart such advice and direction through the undersigned.

Where the disease is described by the applicant the charge will be only fifty cents and two postage stamps. If written out from autograph or lock of hair, \$1 and two stamps.

A. UNDERHILL, M. D.

Cleveland, Ohio, April 24th, 1862.

P. O. Address to Box 2763.

**MILO A. TOWNSEND,**

DEALER IN

BOOKS, STATIONARY, WALL PAPER  
Toys and Fancy Articles,  
NEW BRIGHTON, PA.